



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

LITERARY ADAPTATIONS AND REFERENCES IN PETRONIUS

By R. B. STEELE
Vanderbilt University

I

Tacitus (*Ann.* xvi. 19) records for the year 66 A.D. the death of Petronius, who had been raised to eminence by his indolence as others by their industry. But this judgment must be read in the light of the other statement of Tacitus in regard to Agricola: *gnarus sub Nerone temporum, quibus inertia pro sapientia fuit* (*Agr.* vi. 16). As consul, and as proconsul in Bithynia, he had shown himself equal to the transaction of the affairs of state, and, when enrolled among the favorites of Nero, he won for himself the title *Elegantiae Arbiter*, for Nero considered him as the ultimate authority in matters of taste, and nothing as elegantly luxurious which had not met his approval. His ability is well expressed in the lines of Pope:

Fancy and art in gay Petronius please
The scholar's fancy and the courtier's ease.

—*Essay on Criticism*, ll. 688–89.

To him is assigned a romance, originally in sixteen books, of which two have come down to us in slightly abbreviated form. His object seems to have been, at least in what we have of his work, to show the practices of the court at Rome (*illud erat vivere*, 44, "that was the life"), worked out under provincial conditions. So well has he done this that the Banquet of Trimalchio fits into the conditions under Augustus, Tiberius, Claudius, and Nero, and the place may be any Grecian city on the seashore of Italy.

There are several statements which indicate that Petronius had in mind the court of Nero. Chief among these are the references to Menecrates (73), to the *Trioae halosis* (89), and to the poetry of Lucan (118). There are also others of almost equal weight. Did not Trimalchio (29), as did Nero, have a gold box into

which he put his shavings (Suet. *Nero* 12)? In accordance with a custom hitherto unheard of (*inaudito more*, 70), he had the feet of his guests anointed, a practice which had been suggested to Nero by Otho (Pliny *N.H.* xiii. 3 [4]. 22). The position of Trimalchio at the banquet: *cui locus novo more primus servabatur* (31), looks as if it were the practice of a princeps like Nero imitated by a provincial parvenu. However this may be, there is certainly a reflection of life under Nero in the words *tandem ergo discubuimus pueris Alexandrinis aquam in manus nivatam infundentibus* (31). Seneca (*N.Q.* iv. 13. 10) has *nivatis potionibus*, and snow was also used by Nero for cooling purposes (Suet. *Nero* 27). Noticeable also is the statement in Suet. *Nero* 20: *Captus autem modulatis Alexandrinorum laudationibus, qui de novo commeatu Neapolim confluxerant, plures Alexandria evocavit*. Petronius clearly presents the type in 68: *Puer Alexandrinus, qui caldam ministrabat, lusciniæ coepit imitari*. Trimalchio proclaims himself a man among men (39), and gives a detailed description of the house he had built, not unlike Nero, who after building the Golden Palace declared that at length he had begun to live as a man (Suet. *Nero* 31). The offending atriensis was relegated to Baiae (53) in accordance with a law of Nero that convicts should be used on his public works: *Quorum operum perficiendorum gratia quod ubique esset custodiae in Italiam deportari, etiam scelere convictos nonnisi ad opus damnari praeceperat* (Suet. *Nero* 31). Attention may also be called to the words of Encolpius: *Ergo me non ruina terra potuit haurire?* (81) possibly suggested by the words of Nero as given in Suet. *Nero* 38. The remarks of Trimalchio on *continere* (47) were certainly later than the proposed edict of Claudius: *quo veniam daret flatum crepitumque ventris in convivio emittendi, cum periclitatum quendam prae pudore ex continentia repperisset* (Suet. *Claud.* 32). The zeal shown for the Green at the Banquet, in the *ostiarius prasinatus* (28), the commendation *etsi prasinianus es famosus* (70), and the challenge *si prasinus proximis circensibus primam palmam*, suit the times of Nero (Suet. *Nero* 22), although also in harmony with conditions under Caligula (Suet. *Cal.* 55).

Petronius does not name the place where the Banquet was held, but incidentally speaks of it as a Greek city by the sea. It had

commercial relations with Rome (76), as also with Tarentum (38 and 100); compare also *Melissa Tarentina* (61). *Sic notus Ulixes?* says Trimalchio of himself (39), and he certainly was foxy enough not to place within the range of the knowledge of any who were present his story that at Cumae he had seen with his own eyes the Sibyl hanging in a bottle, and when the boys said to her, "Sibyl, what do you want?" she replied, "I want to die." It is a nice story, but is merely a variation of the one told by Livy (v. 22. 5) about Juno and the Roman soldiers at the capture of Veii. The setting of this story at Cumae invalidates any argument that the Banquet was there, or at any place in the vicinity. Some other of Trimalchio's geographical items must be placed among the keenest pieces of satire in the work. He says of his wine: *In suburbano nascitur eo, quod ego non novi. dicitur confine esse Tarraciniensibus et Tarentinis. nunc coniungere agellis Siciliam, ut cum Africam libuerit ire, per meos fines navigem* (48). When the actuary read his report *tamquam urbis acta* (53), Trimalchio was angry because he then learned that the Pompeian gardens had been bought the year before. Yet with these almost boundless resources he had still greater hopes: *Si contigerit fundos Apuliae iungere, satis vivus pervenero* (77).

Wherever the city was, the chief actor Encolpius, when the stars were shining (99), set sail on a ship belonging to Lichas of Tarentum, and bound for that place (100). The doings of the night and of a part of the next day are given in detail. A storm comes on, and *Siciliam modo ventus dabat, saepissime [in oram] Italici litoris aquilo possessor convertibat huc illuc obnoxiam ratem*. Darkness comes with the storm (114), because it was thus in the case of Aeneas, and the master of the ship is swept into the sea, as in Verg. *Aen.* i. 115. Encolpius and two companions reach the shore, and spend the night in a fisherman's hut. On the next day the corpse of the master is driven to the shore, and Encolpius bewails him because "Yesterday he set the day on which he was going to arrive at home. O gods and goddesses, how far from his destination does he lie!" Immediately after the burial they pursue their way, and in a moment of time see, not far away, a city placed on a lofty cliff. From a countryman they learn that it is Croton, a very ancient city and once upon a time the foremost of

Italy. Unless we frankly claim that the work, as we have it, does not correctly indicate the length of the voyage, the Greek city by the sea must be placed only part of a day's voyage from Croton. The shipwreck was near Croton, although the mention of Sicily (see above) seems to place it on the western coast of Italy. If incorrectly stated geographical data help portray the workings of the mind of Trimalchio, the nautical data, without due assignment, may perhaps in like manner be modeled after the yarn of some sailor psychically akin to those who swapped lies in the camp of Agricola (Tac. *Agr.* 25).

The reflections which are scattered through the work indicate that the writer was a critic of art, of literature, and of eloquence. In some gallery (83) he saw a work of Zeuxis not yet tarnished by age, and adored pictures by Apelles, the outlines of which were drawn with such subtlety that one might think he was looking at living beings. He bewailed the degeneracy of his own times, when men, accusers of antiquity, learn and teach its vices only (88). Great literary works have ceased, and love of intellect makes no one rich (83), or, as it is expressed in the same section:

Sola pruinosis horret facundia pannis
Atque inopi lingua desertas invocat artes.

Not only this but oratory has degenerated into declamation, "and recently a windy and unregulated loquacity emigrated from Asia to Athens, and, as if it were a pestilential star, blasted the minds of young men rising to great things, and eloquence, once for all corrupted, stood still and was silent" (2). But even amid degeneracy, principles remain unchanged, and they who would be orators "should drink from the Maeonian fount, should shake the arms of the mighty Demosthenes, or hurl the words of the unsubdued Cicero" (5). The statements are akin to some in Longinus *On the Sublime*, and both the positive and the negative phases of his criticism are like those in the *Dialogus de oratoribus*.

It would be interesting if we could determine whether the coloring by Seneca, either in general or in particular scenes, had been purposely changed by Petronius. The former inveighs against luxurious feasts; the latter portrays one complete to satiety.

Trimalchio boasts that he had never heard a philosopher (71), and *oportet etiam inter cenandum philologiam nosse* (39). To Seneca philosophy was the guide of life, but "nowadays teachers are showing us how to dispute and not how to live, and that which was philosophy has become philology" (*Ep.* 108. 23). Seneca mentions, as an example of inexcusable luxury, the immense amounts spent on ear-rings (*Dial.* vii. 17. 2). But he has no remedy, as has Petronius: "What," says Habinnas, "you cleaned me out that I might buy a glass bean for you. If I had a daughter I'd cut off her dear little ears" (67). Seneca gives, as if it were a proverb, *nemo cum sarcinis enatat* (*Ep.* 22. 12), and Petronius illustrates its truth in the case of Tryphaena (114), while *ubique naufragium est* (115) is a summary of Seneca's portrayal of life's shipwreck (*Dial.* xi. 9. 6). Seneca, *Ad Helviam matrem de consolatione* (*Dial.* xii. 19. 6) lauds the sister whom Egypt for sixteen years approved *velut unicum sanctitatis exemplum*. Petronius probably brought with him from the East the story of the Widow of Ephesus, *tam notae erat pudicitiae, ut vicinarum quoque gentium feminas ad spectaculum sui evocaret* (111), and of whom, when her husband died, men said *solum affulsisse verum pudicitiae amorisque exemplum*. But it was only a five-day flash. There is a possibility that what Seneca wrote may have furnished suggestions to Petronius, but each reader must decide for himself in regard to the probability. Similar phrases, as *qui vincitur, vincit* (59), which are not unusual in Seneca, e.g., *Dial.* iv. 34. 5, were probably a part in the current of daily speech; but in others there is the possibility of satiric adaptation by Petronius, as *vita vinum est* (34): Sen. *Dial.* ix. 10. 4: *omnis vita servitium est*; and *gaudimonio dissilio* (61): Sen. *Dial.* i. 4. 10: *cruditate dissiliunt*. There are also other possibilities, and it might be some personal gratification to portray at some Elysian convivium a conversation on Roman morals between Petronius the satirist and Seneca the philosopher. But let us digress to our subject.

II

Petronius invented a provincial Maecenas, and named him Caius Pompeius Trimalchio Maecenatianus (71). Of the original and of the imitation it can be truly said that physically and psychically *Utrumque eorum incredibili modo consensit astrum*. How

closely they resembled each other can be seen by comparing *pallio enim coccineo adrasum excluserat caput* (32) and *hunc esse, qui in tribunali, in rostris, in omni publico coetu sic adparuerit, ut pallio velaretur caput exclusis utrimque auribus* (Sen. *Ep.* 114. 6). Their marital relations seem to have been the same, although Petronius could give an account of only one little rift in the domestic felicity of Trimalchio and Fortunata to the thousand mentioned for Maecenas and Terentia. It may be accidental that the names of the wives are syllabled the same. Both men wrote poetry, and the essence of what Seneca says of the work of Maecenas is given by Petronius in one word *distorta* (55). Still, given a word or a suggestion from another poet, Trimalchio was somewhat of a poetical builder, as is shown by the lines in 34:

Eheu nos miseros, quam totus homuncio est.
Sic erimus cuncti postquam nos auferet Orcus.
Ergo vivamus, dum licet esse bene.

In addition to the Maecenatian traits he had some common with other great men. The warning from the boy at the entrance to the triclinium *dextro pede* (30) is an indication of his superstition; see Mayor *ad Juv.* x. 5. His memory was like that of Calvisius: *Huic memoria tam mala erat, ut illi modo nomen Ulixis excideret, modo Achillis, modo Priami* (Sen. *Ep.* 27. 5). His funereal comedy (71-72) reminds one of Turannius (Sen. *Dial.* x. 20. 3), as his business operations do of Demetrius Pompeianus (Sen. *Dial.* ix. 8. 6).

Trimalchio had come as a slave from Asia, and had become versed in both literature and history. Had he not two libraries, one Greek and one Latin? His words show how thoroughly he had mastered both: *Diomedes et Ganymedes duo fratres fuerunt. horum soror erat Helene. Agamemnon illam rapuit et Dianae cervam subiecit. ita nunc Homeros dicit, quemadmodum inter se pugnent Troiani et Tarentini. vicit scilicet et Iphigeniam, filiam suam, Achilli dedit uxorem. ob eam rem Ajax insanit* (59). Similar are his remarks about Cassandra and Niobe (52), and these, with his account of Corinthian pieces, well illustrate the assumed characteristics of his memory: "That you may not think me a nonsense, I know mighty well where Corinthian pieces first came from.

When Ilium was taken, Hannibal, a knavish man and mighty rascal, piled all the statues, copper and gold, and silver, into one pile and set them on fire, and they were all made into miscellaneous bronzes" (50). He then tells the story of a smith who made a glass vessel, and in the presence of Caesar dropped it on the floor. It was merely dented, as if it had been of copper. When Caesar learned that the maker alone knew the composition of it, he ordered him to be beheaded, *quia enim, si scitum esset, aurum pro luto haberemus*. Pliny *N.H.* xxxvi. 66. (26) 195 records a somewhat similar incident under the Emperor Tiberius. Trimalchio does not tell exactly the same story, but he would not have been Trimalchio if he had. Another satiric touch to be placed with these is *Falernum Opi-mianum annorum centum* (34). This merely indicates the belief of Trimalchio that the wine could be had of any age, either one or a hundred years old.

The Banquet of Trimalchio is noticeable for its expressional features. There were recited the poems of great writers, as well as those of Trimalchio himself (41). According to Horace *Ep.* ii. 1. 146: *opprobria rustica* were a part of the program of early gatherings, and at the Banquet these were poured forth in abundance. A few will suffice for illustration: *Tu lacticulosus, nec mu nec ma argutas, vasus fictilis, immo lorus in aqua, lentior non melior* (57), "you little suckling, you babble neither boo nor baa, you mud-jug, no, a lash in water, limberer, not better"; *caepa cirrata*, "frizzled onion"; *mus, immo terrae tuber* (58), "rat, no, toad-stool," Fitting accompaniments of this talk are the charades and conundrums by which one might win renown for wisdom. But where shall we place *bucca, bucca, quot sunt hic?* (64) which the boy on his master's back shouted as he struck him with his open hand? All this is subartistic, although potential material for literary satire. There are also a number of proverbs, some of which had worked their way into literature, as *manus manum lavat* (45), and *plane qualis dominus, talis et servus* (58). Here and there is a touch akin to comedy, as *Nam isti maiores maxillae semper Saturnalia agunt* (44), which does not differ much from the words of the parasite in Plaut. *Capt.* 468: *Ita ventur gutturque resident esurialis ferias*, "so are their guts and gullets getting eating-holidays."

In this presentation by Petronius of the words and the ways at the Banquet is shown some of the skill which won for him the title *Elegantiae Arbiter* at the Imperial court. He was a master of the pleasures of his time, intellectual and physical, high and low. He spent his last hours listening to men repeating, nothing about the immortality of the soul, or the maxims of wise men, but light songs and ready verses. He was a producer as well as a reproducer, though a dividing line between the two cannot be rigidly drawn. However, the literary material in his work can be classified in a general way as (a) original and (b) adapted.

a) *Original material*.—After mentioning Cicero and Publilius, he asks the question: *Quid enim his melius dici potest* (55)? There follow sixteen lines whose substance is about as follows:

In the jaws of luxury the walls of Mars are crumbling. For your palate is fed the cooped-up peacock, 'clad in its golden Babylonian plumage.' For you the Numidian hen; for you the caponed cock; also the stork, a friendly guest from foreign lands, a mother-dutiful, slender-footed, graceful-dancing bird, winter's exile, harbinger of spring, has just now made its nest in the stewing-kettle of prodigality. Why the necklace dear to you, the Indian pearl? Is it that the matron decked with trappings from the sea, may parade, untamed, in imported coverings? For what the green emerald, the costly glass? Why do you wish the fiery Carthaginian stones? (for aught) excepting that probity may flash from carbuncles. Is it proper that a bride put on the woven wind, to stand forth openly exposed in a linen cloud?

Whether these are the lines of Publilius, as they are given by Ribbeck, *Scen. Roman. Poesis. Frag.* ii. 369 (3d ed.), or are the work of Petronius himself, there is equal judgment either in the selection or in the production. But whoever may have been the creator, the marked vigor of the lines, the skill in the choice and application, perhaps also in the coining of words, as *pietaticultrix gracilipes crotalistria*, mark the writer as a poet of no little merit, and show for Petronius fine creative or appreciate power.

Trimalchio is represented as coming from Asia, entering Rome, *Minerva ducente* (29), mastering a large part of Italy, and having painted on the walls of his house some scenes from his own career. In writing these portions Petronius brought down to satire some epic touches, for Vergil represents Aeneas as leaving Troy *ducente deo* (*Aen.* ii. 632), and finding portrayed on the walls of the temple

at Carthage some events in which he himself had taken part. This suggested to Petronius the putting into his work of the *Troiae halosis* which he may have seen at Rome. A description of the picture is given in sixty-five lines (88). Bearing in mind that he is writing of the picture and not of the destruction of Troy, we can understand the limitations under which he placed himself.

Compared with the Aeneid, this poem is static rather than kinetic, for things do not come into being, but are. There stands the horse, but there is no Laocoön running down from the citadel, no spear vibrating in the side of the beast. The serpents are on the sea, and then they are where stand the two sons of Laocoön. The full moon has already lifted its beaming light when the Greeks pour forth upon the sons of Priam buried in night and wine. The contrast is especially noticeable in the account of the serpents. Vergil (*Aen.* ii. 203–27) gives their entire course from Tenedos, till they lie concealed under the feet of the goddess. Petronius suggests their motion by mentioning a sound such as that of oars on a silent night borne from afar when ships press on the sea, and the surface re-echoes, beaten by the on-borne pine. “We gaze upon the scene. Serpents with their double coils sweep the floods against the rocks, their swollen breasts like lofty ships drive the foam from their sides.” The use of similes to bring to the imagination of the reader the movements which the picture could not portray shows how closely the poet stuck to his theme—the description of the picture itself.

The piece of sculpture known as the Laocoön was produced not far from the time of Petronius, and it is possible that the words of Vergil may have furnished a suggestion nearly at the same time to a painter as well as to a sculptor. However this may be, a number of verbal resemblances show that Petronius, when he wrote, had in mind the words of Vergil. It has been suggested that the lines are a parody on the *Troica* of Nero. It may be, as Suetonius says (*Nero* 38), that Nero recited the Halosis of Troy while Rome was burning, or it may have been merely a rumor (*Tac. Ann.* xv. 39), yet there is nothing in the poem of Petronius in any way indicating that it parodies a poem fit to be recited at such a time, for all that is given precedes the burning. We take the lines for what they profess to

be, the description of a picture, and doing for it what Lessing, centuries later, did for the Laocoön, showing the extent to which the static marble failed to reproduce the kinetic elements in Vergil's portrayal.

On the road to Croton the travelers took up the discussion of literature, and Eumolpius said that young men exercised in forensic pleading betook themselves to the tranquillity of poesy, believing that a poem can be more easily constructed than a controversy with its vibrating aphorisms. But the mind is not able to bring forth offspring unless inundated with a mighty flood of literature. One must avoid all cheapness, so to speak, of words, which must be far removed from the plebs, so as to carry out *odi profanum vulgus et arceo* (118). "Whosoever shall have undertaken the mighty task of the civil war, unless filled with literature, will stagger under the burden. For historical actions ought not to be hampered by verse (historians do the task far better), but through circumlocutions and ministrations of the gods and the storied impulse of maxims, so that it may seem the prophesying of an inspired spirit rather than the trustworthiness of a scrupulous speech under witnesses."

There follow 295 lines, the first part of which (1-61) has none of the characteristics which are named for a successful poem. It is rather a pamphlet on personal and political corruption, and lines 33-37 are used in slightly different form in section 93 also. Well-known joys no longer please, nor pleasures worn by plebeian use. The tiger is imported that it may drink the blood of men while the populace is applauding. From the Sicilian shore the scar is brought alive to the table, and the wave of the Phasis is bereft of its birds. *Ingeniosa gula est* (l. 33), as in Martial xiii. 62. 2.

Political conditions are as bad:

Nec minor in campo furor est, emptique Quirites
Ad praedam strepitumque lucri suffragia vertunt,
Venalis populus, venalis curia patrum,
Est favor in pretio.

Amid all this, Cato alone stands unshaken, and with him sinks Roman power and glory (l. 48). It is war alone that can win back the weal lost by luxury. As this is near the end of the work, it may be taken as an application to the days of Caesar of the con-

ditions of his own, as he passed them in final review, and the same picture might have been drawn either by Seneca or Juvenal.

Lines 61-66 look back to Crassus and ahead to the death of Caesar. Fortune brought forth three leaders whom Enyo overwhelmed. Parthia has Crassus, Pompey lies on the Libyan shore, Julius drenched ungrateful Rome with blood, and, as if the earth could not bear so many tombs, it separated their ashes. Such honors did glory give.

In lines 67-265, as if anticipating the truth of the statement in later times *Bellum est Hellum*, he shows us all the kindred of Mars from Bellona to Tisiphone. Father Dis in a score of lines calls on Fortune to arouse to slaughter, and her reply is nearly as long. Fama fulfills her task, and arms, blood, slaughter, fires, and war flit before the eyes of men (l. 215). Peace, faith, concord, flee from the earth, a throng comes trooping from the lower world, and whatever Discord has ordered is done upon the earth (l. 295).

b) The position of Petronius at the court of Nero was a recognition of his power to utilize or adapt the work of his predecessors, or to draw suggestions from it. The satire furnishes abundant evidence of the latter, in his presentation of provincial conditions. *Plus gratiae orbitas confert quam eripit*, says Seneca (*Dial.* vi. 19. 2), but in ideal Germany *nec ulla orbitatis pretia* (Tac. *Germ.* 20). Petronius seized on this feature, an occasional one at Rome, and shows how men *aut captantur aut captant* at Croton *oppidum tamquam in pestilentia campos, in quibus nihil aliud est nisi cadavera, quae lacerantur, aut corvi, qui lacerant* (116). He recognized the keenness of Caligula's characterization of Livia Augusta *Ulixes stolatus* (Suet *Cal.* 23), and Fortunata became a *Cassandra caligaria* (74). The suicide fiasco (108) has a prototype in the action of Germanicus (Tac. *Ann.* i. 35). Here also each must judge for himself the extent to which Petronius consciously used these incidents and the literary material of others. The larger part of the latter is poetical, though a few points may have been derived from Livy. In xxxi. 14. 7 we read of a Grecian war that had been brought on because some young men had *imprudentes* entered a temple at Athens. The amatory war in Petronius had a similar beginning, *imprudentes enim, admisistis inexpiabile scelus* (17). There may

be no connection between these passages, nor between *ubi laxatas sensit custodias* (Livy xxi. 32. 12) and *ut viderunt laxatum custodiam* (1112). But surely Petronius knew the story of Quinctius recorded by Livy (xxxv. 49. 6-7) about the banquet of his Chalcidian host *hominis boni et sciti convivatoris*, who, when the guests were wondering at the varieties of meat served, *renidens condimentis ait varietatem illam et speciem ferinae carnis ex mansueto sue factam*. The Daedulus of Trimalchio has equal skill: *Ista cocus meus de porco fecit . . . volueris, de vulva faciet piscem, de lardo palumbum, de perna turturem, de colaepio gallinam* (70), although by this time perhaps all cooks had reached the same high eminence.

The poetical adaptations are much more numerous, and may be a word, a phrase, or a metrical group, either changed or unchanged from the original. Catullus has in v. 1:

Vivamus, mea Lesbia, atque amemus,

while Trimalchio gives in 34:

Ergo vivamus, dum licet esse bene.

The use of *vivamus* only of the line of Catullus is one of the keenest satiric touches in Petronius, as is *Odes* ii. 12. 21 ff. in Horace; see Seneca *Ep.* 114. 6: *Hunc esse, qui uxorem miliens duxit, cum unam habuerit*. We can understand the restraint of Trimalchio if we read his endearing epithets to his wife: *fulcipedia . . . milva . . . amasiuncula . . . sterteia* (75) and *vipera* (77), when she had done nothing more than call him *canis* (74). The words *mihi pontus inertes* | *submittit fluctus* (134. 4) are certainly a conscious adaptation of Lucretius *De rerum natura* i. 7: *tibi suavis daedala tellus* | *submittit flores*, the partial equivalence in the spelling of the last word in each, and the parallel arrangement of the words in the lines being especially noticeable. Compare also for a similar change and setting (82): *Non bibit inter aquas poma aut pendentia carpit* | *Tantalus*, and Ovid *Am.* ii. 2. 43: *Quaerit aquas in aquis et poma fugacia captat* | *Tantalus*. For another setting see Hor. *Sat.* i. 1. 68: *Tantalus a labris sitiens fugientia captat* | *flumina*. The ending of line 35 of this same poem of Ovid, *iurgia nectat*, appears as *iurgia nectit* in Petronius 18. Equally serviceable for the meter is Verg. *Copa* 21: *lentis uva racemis*, which is changed to *passis uva racemis* in 135. 14. These are enough to illustrate the forms of the

membra disiecta with which the satire abounds. It might be expected that Ovid, Propertius, and Tibullus would furnish much material, but the days of love intrigues and of lovelorn youths had passed, and immorality needed no subterfuge. *Amica vincit | uxorem. Rosa cinnamum veretur*, says Petronius (93. 8), and he found his poetical delicacies in Vergil and more especially in Horace.

At the Banquet a slave, acting under orders, suddenly began to recite:

Interea medium Aeneas classe tenebat.

Nullus sonus unquam acidior percussit aures meas. nam praeter errantis barbariae aut adiectum aut deminutum clamorem miscebat Atellanicos versus, ut tunc primum me etiam Vergilius offenderit.

Juvenal has in *Sat.* xi. 182:

Quid referet, tales versus quo voce legantur?

and this is a sufficient commentary on the delivery. However, the statement is of interest as indicating that by this time slaves were being trained to recite Vergil. Tryphaena has an adaptation of *Aen.* ii. 594 in 108:

Quis furor, exclamat, pacem convertit in arma?

But of much more importance is the story about the Widow of Ephesus (111-12), whose maid repeated to her some lines spoken by Anna to the Queen of Carthage (*Aen.* iv. 34 and 38):

Id cinerem aut manes credis sentire sepultos?
placitone etiam pugnabis amori?
nec venit in mentem, quorum consederis arvis?

Eumolpius repeats the story as of a thing done within his recollection (110), and elsewhere (88), speaks in the pluperfect subjunctive of his residence at Pergamum. We know nothing of his wanderings, so that little light is thrown on the question, how long after the time of Vergil did his verses become a part of the intellectual equipment of maids in Ephesus and errant damsels in Italy?

There are a few interesting instances of adaptation. Vergil (*Aen.* vi. 469) has the following of the interview between Aeneas and Dido:

Illa solo fixos oculos aversa tenebat,
Nec magis incepto vultum sermone movetur,
Quam si dura silex aut stet Marpesia cautes.

Petronius with an eye to the satiric effect has *haec ut iratus effudi* (132), with the first two of Vergil's lines, but changing the third to

Quam lentae salices lassove papavera collo,

the first part being common enough, the latter part from Verg. *Aen.* ix. 432. The travellers talked over the ways of escaping from the ship of Lichas (102), one suggesting *per funem lapsi descendimus*, just as did the Greeks from the Trojan horse, *demissum lapsi per unem* (Verg. *Aen.* ii. 262). The words of Giton: *satis magnum, erit misero solacium, sua voluntate cecidisse* (91) give the thought in Verg. *Aen.* iii. 306:

Si pereo, hominum manibus perisse iuvabit.

The words *genua amplexus* in the next line, combined with *ne vertere vellet* (ii. 652) make up *genua ego perseverantis amplector, ne morientes vellet occidere* (98).

From a literary standpoint the most important of the words of Petronius are *Horatii curiosa felicitas* (118). A dozen examples will be enough to show the method of using the material, most of which occurs in prose passages with little or no verbal agreement, as only the general sentiment is reproduced. Though the phrasing is entirely different, the appearance of Priapus *secundum quietem* (104) recalls the appearance of Quirinus to Horace *post mediam noctem* (*Sat.* i. 10. 31). Similar to this pair, and with a little closer verbal resemblance, is *quod quisque perperam didicit, in senectute confiteri non vult* (4), suggested by the words *et quae | imberbi didicere senes, perdenda fateri* (*Ep.* ii. 1. 85). *Et sane iam lucernae mihi plures videbantur ardere* (64) may record an actual experience without reference to *Ut semel icto | accessit fervor capiti numerusque lucernis* (*Sat.* ii. 1. 25). Compare Juvenal vi. 305:

Ambulat et geminis exsurgit mensa lucernis.

Ne me Crispini scrinia lippi | compilasse putes, verbum non amplius addam (*Sat.* i. 1. 120) is so unusual that it must have suggested: *Ne me putes improbasse schedium Lucilianae humilitatis, quod sentio, et ipse carmine effingam* (4). The conclusion is, in one case positive, in the other negative, yet the use of *putes* in both, and the balancing of *scrinia compilasse* by *improbasse schedium* is the sure sign of adaptation. There is not infrequently, as in this statement,

the same theme with a word or two as a tag to indicate the source. The following are illustrations: *In aurem aliquid secreto diceret* (28): *in aurem | dicere nescio quid puero* (Sat. i. 1. 9); *nummos modio metitur* (37): *dives | ut metiretur nummos* (Sat. i. 6. 95); *quis enim potest probare diversa?* (84): *laudet diversa sequentis* (Sat. i. 1. 3 and 109); *dum loqueris, levis pruina dilabitur* (99); *dum loquimur, fugerit invida aetas* (Odes i. 11. 7). With the last compare *sic vita truditur* (45) and *truditur dies die* (Odes ii. 18. 15). *Fundos mendaces* (117) differs in number only from the words in *Odes* iii. 11. 30, while the description of Trimalchio *nihil autem tam inaequale erat* (52) is a variation of what Horace has about Tigellius in *Sat.* i. 3. 9: *nil aequale homini fuit illi*.

Metrical necessities determined the form of the adaptations in the poetical portions and the extent of the variation from the form in Horace. The command: *quare da nobis vina Falerna, puer* (55.3) comes from the question in *Odes* ii. 11. 20: *quis puer ocius | restinguet ardentis Falerni | pocula?* The description of the cottage (135) has the same keynote: *Non Indum fulgebat ebur*, as has *Odes* ii. 18: *Non ebur*. Closeness in verbal adaptation is well illustrated by *feriemus sidera verbis* (*Fr.* 32. 7), which differs from *feriam sidera vertice* (*Odes* i. 1. 36) little more than *verbis* differs from *vertice*, and this almost disappears in the English pronunciation of the Latin. As a still better illustration we give *ludebat aquis errantibus amnis* (131. 4) and *fontesque lymphis obstrepunt manantibus*, (*Ep.* ii. 27). The perfect succession of liquids in *lymphis . . . manantibus*, with the ripple caused by the *ph* is not quite attained by Petronius with *aquis errantibus*, in which the successive initial vowels *a* and *e* take the place of the initial consonants *l* and *m*. This seems to be the most successful attempt on the part of Petronius to reproduce, although with a slightly different effect, the *curiosa felicitas* of Horace.

Considering only the larger phases of the subject, we find that Petronius is concerned chiefly with Lucan, Vergil, and Horace. In this he anticipated later conditions as set forth in the *Dialogus de oratoribus* 20: "There is demanded nowadays from the orator poetical charm, not foul with the moss of Accius and Pacuvius, but brought forth from the shrine of Horace and Vergil and Lucan."